



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/077,146	02/15/2002	Feng-Wei Chen	RSW920010155US1	1291
5	7590 06/30/2003			
Gerald R. Woods			EXAMINER	
IBM Corporati			HERNANDEZ, OLGA	
P.O. Box 12195 Research Triangle Park, NC 27709			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
5 ,			3661	
			DATE MAILED: 06/30/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

,		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		10/077,146	CHEN ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit
		Olga Hernandez	3661
	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet	vith the correspondence address
Period fo	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPI	VIQ SET TO EVOIDE 21	MONTH(S) EDOM
THE   - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failu - Any	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION making of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu eply received by the Office later than three months after the maili and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	.136(a). In no event, however, may a ply within the statutory minimum of th d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC te, cause the application to become a	ireply be timely filed  irty (30) days will be considered timely.  INTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28	March 2003 .	
2a)⊠		his action is non-final.	
3)	Since this application is in condition for allow		atters, prosecution as to the merits is
,	closed in accordance with the practice unde on of Claims		
4)🖂	Claim(s) $\underline{1-14}$ is/are pending in the application	n.	
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	awn from consideration.	
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-14</u> is/are rejected.		
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/ on Papers	or election requirement.	
	The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.	
	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ acc		the Examiner.
,	Applicant may not request that any objection to t	· ·	
11)	The proposed drawing correction filed on		• •
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in r		
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer.	
Priority (	ınder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
13)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig	gn priority under 35 U.S.C	. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a)	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:		
	1. Certified copies of the priority documer	nts have been received.	
	2. Certified copies of the priority documer	nts have been received in	Application No
* 5	3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri- application from the International B see the attached detailed Office action for a lis	ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))	
14) 🗌 A	acknowledgment is made of a claim for domes	tic priority under 35 U.S.C	. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
	)  The translation of the foreign language practice. The translation of the foreign language process. The translation is made of a claim for domestic.	• •	
Attachmen			
2) Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice o	v Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) f Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) .
J.S. Patent and T PTO-326 (Re		Action Summary	Part of Paper No. 6

Application/Control Number: 10/077,146

Art Unit: 3661

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 3/24/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The examiner disagrees with the applicant with respect that Watanabe does not use a spatially-enable system. As the applicant says in his arguments (paper no.5, page 12, line12): "The term "spatially-enabled database" is well known in the art, and such databases are described in Applicants' specification." Therefore, both parts agree that the "spatially –enabled" is not subject of patentability. Further, as described in page 2 line 8 of applicants' specification, which is under: "Description of the related art" clarifies that it is adapted for use with geographical information system (GIS) data. Which is what Watanabe prior art does.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nobe et al (5,657,231) in view of Watanabe et al (6,269,303).

Nobe teaches a route setting method in a navigation system for obtaining a shortest route from starting position to a destination position, includes the steps of: selecting, out of links each corresponding to a partial route connecting two route positions adjacent to each other on a route,

Art Unit: 3661

candidacy links each connected to one of confirmed links which include a link corresponding to

the partial route connected to the starting position and which have been confirmed; judging

whether or not each of the candidacy links selected by the selecting step is able to pass

therethrough according to link judgment information, which corresponds to a connection

relationship between each of the candidacy links and the confirmed link connected to each of the

candidacy links and which is set in advance; confirming one of the candidacy links judged to be

able to pass therethrough by the judging step, which has the shortest integrated route distance

from the starting position, as a new confirmed link; and repeating the selecting, judging and

confirming steps with respect to the confirmed links including the new confirmed link by the

confirming step (figures 2, 4 and 5).

Nobe does not teach determining the use of the spatially-enabled database. However, Watanabe teaches a navigation system which provides roué guidance, wherein the database of Watanabe is shown in figures 2A through 2E to also include latitude and longitude information

for each of the intersections in the database (therefore, it is considered to be spatially enabled).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the

aforementioned inventions in order to more easily select potential intersections nearest to the

shortest distance line connecting the origin and destination points.

Conclusion

4. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Application/Control Number: 10/077,146

Art Unit: 3661

Page 4

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Olga Hernandez whose telephone number is (703) 305-0918. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William A. Cuchlinski can be reached on (703) 308-3873. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-7687 for regular communications and (703) 305-7687 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

> Olga Hernandez Examiner

Art Unit 3661

MILLIAM A. CUCHLINSKI, JR. SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600**